

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

P.O. Box 5312	1975	
Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations		
THOMSON Licensing LLC		
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312	PATEL, NIRAV G	
2634	APER NUMBER	
MAIL DATE E	LIVERY MODE	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/584,323	STAUDER ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Nirav G. Patel	2624		
All Participants: Status of Application:				
(1) Nirav G. Patel.	(3)			
(2) Wan Yee Cheung (Reg. No.: 42,410).	(4)			
Date of Interview: 15 June 2010	Time: 3:15 p.m.			
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No				
If Yes, provide a brief description:				
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed:				
Prior art documents discussed:  Onda				
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet				
Part III.				
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>				
/Nirav G. Patel/				
Examiner, Art Unit 2624	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Application No. 10/584,323

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated that the amendments submitted on 3/24/2010 are essentially the same as those which were previously rejected in the Final Office Action dated 6/2/2009 and that prosecution was not being advanced. The Examiner indicated his interpretation of the reference and how it still reads on the amended claims, and as such requested the applicants to point out any subject matter which may not be claimed but is in the originally filed specification. The applicants indicated that a further review would be needed and therefore were unable to further discuss the case.